

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/620,677	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MCNITT, MICHAEL J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hadi Akhavannik	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

**All Participants:**

(1) Hadi Akhavannik.

(2) Michael McNitt.

**Status of Application: Allowed**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 15 August 2007

**Time:** 3:00 PM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*Rejection of claim 1 under Nesbit in view of Tagget.*

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:  
*Please see attached sheet of references that are from the same field of endeavor*


**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 ISH RAT SHERALI  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER  
 8-18-07

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Continuation of rejections discussed: The applicant and examiner discussed amendments to indecent claim 1. Also, the applicant provided the examiner with a list of competing inventions that work in the same field of endeavor of the applicant's invention. The list is attached to the interview summary sheet. . .

Appn. Number: 10/620,677  
Appn. Filed: 2003 Jul 16  
Applicants: McNitt, Michael J.  
Appn. Title: Method And System For Physical Motion Analysis And Training Of A Golf Club Swing Motion Using Image Analysis Techniques  
Examiner/GAU: Hadi Akhavannik

### **Patent Application Interview Summary**

August 1, 2007

Applicant described in detail the operation of the invention using the website home page ([www.dvputt.com](http://www.dvputt.com)) as a reference. Applicant discussed the primary differences between the present invention and the cited prior art of Nesbit et al. (5772522), Taggett (6254492).

The applicant explained the primary differences and advantages of the present invention as:

- the present invention determines and presents actual measurements relative to a datum (the exact trajectory the golf ball must roll along to reach the target zone).
- the calibration process determines the exact ball trajectory to the target (datum) and aligns the system to that datum and compensates for camera position inaccuracies and lens distortion
- the single head marker feature is used to determine not only position and velocity but also angle (cited prior art requires at least two sensors and/or markers to do so).
- the same single camera used to record scene motion is also used to trigger the analysis processes (does not require an external sensor or second camera).

The Patent Examiner pointed out a missing strike through and incorrect language in the amended claim set.

Furthermore, the applicant discussed competitive products currently in the market place and how they differ from the present invention.

The SAM Putt Lab offered by Science and Motion (see <http://www.scienceandmotion.ca/main.html>) product does not use an optical method (a camera) to sense and analyze the motion of the putter head. This non-optical method does not allow the user to see the video representation of their actual putter as it moves through the putting stroke. The non-optical

sensing method used by the Putt Lab requires that the golfer clamp a relatively heavy hardware sensing device onto the shaft of the putter. The weight of the device and connecting cable interfere with the motion of the putting stroke to some degree.

The Tomi system offered by Pure Motion, Inc. (see <http://www.tomi.com/>) also uses a non-optical sensing method and also requires clamping a hardware device to the shaft of the putter.

The SEVA-Putt used internally by GolfTEC ([www.golftec.com](http://www.golftec.com)) uses a magnetic sensing system to determine the motion of the putter head. Again, a corded sensor device is clamped to the shaft of the putter head.

None of the competitive systems mentioned above use an optical method of detecting and measuring motion. The optical method, as used in the current invention, can use inexpensive convention camera hardware (webcam) and when used with a laptop computer, can be completely powered by the battery contained within the laptop.